

**ASHWINI SUKTHANKAR ESQ.  
5 JONES STREET  
RHINECLIFF, NEW YORK 12574  
Tel: 646 725 9925**

***VIA ECF and Email* Donnelly\_chambers@nyed.uscourts.gov**

Honorable Judge Ann M. Donnelly  
United States District Judge  
Eastern District of New York  
225 Cadman Plaza East  
Courtroom 4GN  
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Re: Sylla et. al v Amazon Labor Union et. al.  
Case No. 23-cv-05261  
**Emergency Letter Motion to Enjoin the  
Monitor From Overruling the Decisions of the  
Election Committee**

Dear Honorable Judge Donnelly:

My name is Ashwini Sukthankar, and I am an attorney admitted to practice in the State of New York. I am also admitted in the Southern District of New York and willing to take the necessary steps to be admitted in the Eastern District of New York if the issue below requires.

I serve as counsel to the Election Committee of the Amazon Labor Union, (as a result of its affiliation with the Teamsters Union on June 17, 2024, now known as ALU-IBT, Local 1). The Committee was elected at the ALU Nomination meeting on May 11, 2024 for the upcoming officer election. I believe that the Monitor appointed under the consent order, Mr. Richard Levy, oversteps his role in disregarding decisions of the Election Committee regarding eligibility to run for office. Furthermore, the monitor has given nominees a deadline of 3PM today to make a decision whether or not to accept his decision. I believe that this warrants this emergency appeal to the Court.

Under Article 5.1 of the ALU Constitution (Exhibit 1), determining eligibility is the responsibility of the Elections Committee. In my opinion, this does not conflict with Point 22 of the Consent Order, which states that “any disputes between the parties regarding [nominating procedures and election rules] will be resolved by the neutral monitor,” for the reason that there is no such dispute. The Election Committee is non-partisan, and concluded its deliberations with the unanimously-held position that no candidate from any of the slates facing challenges should be disqualified, and the slates as they were presented to us should be deemed final.

I had been retained as counsel to assist in deliberations and prepare a final report. I did so immediately upon the conclusion of deliberations, on June 19. Four of the five members of the Committee approved the report as drafted, in emails to me, and the fifth had already confirmed,

during a Committee meeting at which I was present, that he believed all slates should have the right to organize and present their own candidates without external interference. (See report of Election Committee, Exhibit 2)

This morning Mr. Levy circulated an email rejecting each and every one of the Committee's recommendations. (Levy email Exhibit 3) I am concerned that any appeal of his decision, from any one of the candidates he has essentially disqualified, would create further delays to the election. Of even greater concern is the possibility that candidates will be denied the opportunity to appeal, which would cast doubt over the fairness of an election which was intended to heal divisions and disagreements.

I request that the Court convene an immediate conference call with me, Mr. Levy and the parties' attorneys to resolve this issue.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/

Ashwini Sukthankar